

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,716	03/22/2004	Pratik M. Mehta	16356.844 (DC-05928)	9212
	7590 03/14/200 D BOONE, LLP	EXAMINER		
901 MAIN STR	REET, SUITE 3100	PATEL, ANAND B		
DALLAS, TX	/5202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2116	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/14/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary .		10/805,716	MEHTA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
	,	Anand Patel	2116			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status			•			
1)[⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 Fe</u>	ebruary 2007.	•			
·	This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
,,,,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1.3.4.6.8-13.15-18.20-23.25.26.28.30	.31.33-35.37-39 and 41-43 is/are	pending in the application.			
	4) Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,8-13,15-18,20-23,25,26,28,30,31,33-35,37-39 and 41-43 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
,	Claim(s) <u>1,3,4,6,8-13,18,20-23,25,26,28,30,31</u>	.33-35.39 and 41-43 is/are reject	ed.			
·	Claim(s) <u>15-17,37 and 38</u> is/are objected to.					
·	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
	on Papers	•				
•—	The specification is objected to by the Examine					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachmen						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment filed 2/6/07 has been entered and as such claims 1, 8-11, 15-17, 21, 23, 30-31, 33, 37-38, 42 are amended and claim 32 is canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 3, 8-13, 18, 20-23, 25, 30-31, 33-35, 39, 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6901276 to Skinner et al (hereinafter Skinner) in view of Rudis.
 - As per claims 1, 23, Skinner discloses an information handling system (IHS) comprising:
 - A system processor (450);
 - A memory (490) coupled to the system processor (figure 4);
 - A wireless section (420), coupled to the system processor (figure 4), which is powered up to detect the presence of a wireless network external to the IHS (515; column 7, lines 7-21) while the system processor remains in a reduced power state (505; column 7, lines 15-17). Skinner fails to disclose an indicator. Rudis teaches an indicator (page 1, paragraph 4), coupled to the wireless section (display is contained in the device itself), to provide an indication to the user that a wireless network is present with which the IHS can communicate (page 1, paragraph 4). An advantage of the system taught by Rudis is the ability to detect wireless activity within a
 - certain range (page 1, paragraph 2; page 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Skinner with the indicator as taught by Rudis.

 Motivation to modify is to reduce hardware requirements and increase security.

Art Unit: 2116

- As per claims 3, 25, Skinner discloses wherein the reduced power state is a suspend state (column
 7, lines 9-12).
- As per claims 8, 30, Rudis teaches actuating a scan switch to commence powering up the wireless section (page 1, paragraph 5).
- As per claim 9, Skinner discloses powering up the wireless section in response to a wake
 command (column 8, lines 26-28; inherent that a signal is sent to 422 to wake it from the sleep mode).
- As per claims 10, 31, Skinner discloses including providing power to both the wireless section and at least one section of the IHS from a common power source (battery within 90).
- As per claims 11, 33, Skinner discloses wherein the wireless section and the system processor are situated in a common housing (figures 2, 4).
- As per claims 12-13, 34-35, Rudis teaches wherein the indicator is an LED (page 1, paragraph 4).
- As per claims 18, 39, Rudis teaches wherein powering up the wireless section is performed with auxiliary power (page 1, paragraph 4).
- As per claims 20, 41, Rudis teaches wherein the indication is variable (page 1, paragraph 4).
- As per claims 21, 42, Skinner discloses wherein the powering up a wireless section step is performed at predetermined times (column 7, lines 18-37; column 8, lines 23-26).
- As per claims 22, 43, Skinner discloses wherein the predetermined times include fixed time intervals (column 8, lines 23-26).
- 4. Claims 4, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skinner in view of Rudis and US Patent No 7079830 to Critz et al (hereinafter Critz).
 - As per claims 4, 26, Skinner and Rudis fail to disclose a wireless card. Critz teaches wherein the wireless section is a wireless card (160) that plugs into the IHS (column 2, lines 57-59). An advantage of the system taught by Critz is the ability to monitor the status of a network connection more efficiently (column 1, lines 62-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Application/Control Number: 10/805,716

Art Unit: 2116

art at the time of invention to modify Skinner and Rudis with the wireless card as taught by Critz.

Page 4

Motivation to modify is to cut costs.

5. Claims 6, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skinner in view of Rudis

and US Patent Application Publication No 2004/0097257 to Lee.

• As per claims 6, 28, Skinner and Rudis fail to disclose wherein powering up the wireless section

is done prior to booting the IHS. Lee teaches powering up the wireless section prior to booting the

IHS (abstract; paragraph 32). An advantage of the system taught by Lee is the ability to reduce power

consumption (paragraphs 8-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of invention to modify Skinner and Rudis with the specific powering of the wireless section as

taught by Lee. Motivation to modify is to cut costs.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 15-17, 37-38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any

intervening claims. Prior art fails to disclose or suggest storing profile information in a memory

accessible to the wireless section while the system processor remains in the reduced power state or

determining if a detected network matches a network included in the profile information while the system

processor remains in the reduced power state.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2116

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anand Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-7211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on (571) 272-3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2116

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ABP

A.(ELAXIIN) PRIMARY EXAMINER